

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

BRANDON D. GASH, HARRY GASH,)	
and SHERYL GASH,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	No.: 1:19-CV-112-TAV-SKL
)	
BRADLEY COUNTY GOVERNMENT,)	
QUALITY CORRECTIONAL)	
HEALTHCARE, ERIC WATSON,)	
and GABE THOMAS,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		
)	
HARRY GASH and SHERYL GASH,)	
b/n/k ESTATE OF BRANDON D. GASH,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:19-CV-229-TAV-SKL
)	
SHEILA GOINS, JOSH BROWN,)	
DHAVAL PATEL, TASHA BOWERS,)	
DAVID BRANSON, CAROL THOMAS,)	
SCOTT DOVE, ANDERSON SAUNDERS,)	
SAM PAINTER, and CITY)	
OF CLEVELAND,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

These matters are before the Court on the Plaintiffs' motion to consolidate filed in case number 1:19-CV-112 [Doc. 22] and motions to dismiss Plaintiff's original complaint

filed in case numbers 1:19-CV-112 [Docs. 11, 14, 18] and 1:19-CV-229 [Doc. 9]. The Court will address these filings in turn.

I. MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

As set forth above, Plaintiffs have filed a motion to consolidate these cases. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) permits the Court to consolidate cases that present common questions of law or fact. The Court finds that these cases present common questions of law and fact, and the Court finds that it is appropriate to consolidate the two actions. Accordingly, the Court finds that the motion to consolidate in case number 1:19-CV-112 [Doc. 22] is well taken, and will be **GRANTED**.

II. MOTIONS TO DISMISS

Also as set forth above, several Defendants filed motions to dismiss Plaintiff's original complaint in case number 1:19-CV-112 [Docs. 11, 14, 18] and case number 1:19-CV-229 [Doc. 9]. However, Plaintiff subsequently filed an amended complaint in each case, which several Defendants have also moved to dismiss in case numbers 1:19-CV-112 [Docs. 24, 26, 29] and 1:19-CV-229 [Docs. 13, 15]. Thus, the motions to dismiss Plaintiff's original complaint will be **DENIED as moot**.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above:

1. Plaintiffs' motion to consolidate in case number 1:19-CV-112 [Doc. 22] is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, the cases are **CONSOLIDATED** with case number 1:19-cv-112 being designated as the lead case because it is the first-filed of the two cases. All future filings are to be made *only* in the lead case and the Clerk is **DIRECTED** to administer these cases as consolidated for all future proceedings; and

2. The motions to dismiss Plaintiff's original complaint in case number 1:19-CV-112 [Docs. 11, 14, 18] and case number 1:19-CV-229 [Doc. 9] are **DENIED as moot.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Thomas A. Varlan
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE